

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figures 2 and 6. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 2 and 6, replace the original sheets including Figures 2 and 6.

Figure 2 – Add step S10

Figure 6 – Change RB? to RB2?

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3-5, 12 and 14-16 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

DISCLOSURE

The disclosure is objected to because of informalities. Applicant has reviewed the disclosure and has amended it to overcome the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 11, 12 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The claims have been amended to overcome the rejection. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 11, 12, 17 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of JP 2001-097028 (discussed in applicant's specification) and either one of JP 6-344763 or JP 2000-59918. Independent Claims 1 and 12 define that when the regeneration determination means determines that the regenerative electric-power generating unit is in the electric-power generating state, the

control means controls the allowed maximum electric-power value to be greater than that set when no the regenerative electric-power generating unit is in the electric-power generating state. Thus, when the regenerative generating unit is generating power, the allowable maximum power is increased.

As discussed with the Examiner, Applicant has amended Figure 2 to include the step (S10) between step S8 and step S7. Support for the addition of step S10 is given on page 3, lines 19-22; page 17, lines 21-25; and, original Claim 1.

The JP '028 reference describes that electrical power is used for the heater of an air-conditioner when the remaining amount of battery power is larger than a predetermined value. JP '763 and JP '918 teach using the regenerative energy from motor deceleration and/or braking to augment the heating performance by supplying excess power to the electric heater. None of the cited references disclose, teach or suggest increasing the allowed maximum electric-power value in the regeneration state as is now defined in amended Claim 1. Enclosed is a partial translation of the JP '028 reference.

Thus, Applicant believes Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 11, 17 and 18-20, which ultimately depend from Claim 1 or Claim 12, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record.

REJOINDER

Applicant respectfully requests rejoinder of withdrawn Claims 2-10 and 13-16.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 8, 2006

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg